21st October 1927]

Irrigation

Correspondence between the Local Government and the Government of India regarding Mettur dam.

*778 Q.—Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the Local Government telegraphed to the Government of India about the beginning of December 1924 "intimating that certain lands to be acquired for the Mettur Project have been damaged by the recent heavy floods in the Cauvery river, and that the distress resulting therefrom in some cases be relieved by the immediate acquisition of the lands in question, and that the Local Government have been urged by a resolution moved in the Legislative Council to take this course";

(*b*) whether the Government will be pleased to lay on the table of the House a copy of the telegram which is sent to the Government of India about the beginning of December 1924 bearing on the subject and referred to in the despatch of the Government of India to His Majesty's Secretary of State for India, dated Delhi, 11th December 1924, No. 4, Public Works;

(*c*) which was the resolution of the Legislative Council to which reference has been made in the telegram in question; and

(*d*) whether the Government will be pleased to lay on the table of the House a copy of the full letter addressed by the Government of Madras to the Government of India on the subject of the Mettur dam, dated the 26th September 1924, No. 323-1?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) Yes.

(*c*) There was no express resolution—only an assurance given in a discussion on a motion for a supplementary grant (see pages 705–708 of Volume XX-7 of the Proceedings of the House).

(*d*) The Government think it unnecessary to do this—the paragraph omitted from the letter as published only referred to the Irrigation Bill then under consideration.

Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi:—"May I know with reference to (*c*) whether the assurance mentioned therein was not the assurance of the Government or of this House?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell:—"I cannot answer that without reference to the records, Sir. I should like to have notice."

Marine

Tuticorin Harbour scheme.

*788 Q.—Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) what the original and the present estimates of the Tuticorin Harbour scheme are;

(*b*) whether the dredger 'St. George' bought for the harbour works has been found capable of dredging the rock foundations below the 24-feet level;

(*c*) whether the two dredgers 'St. David' and 'St. George' have been condemned by the Port Trust as unfit for the work for which they were purchased;

[21st October 1927

(*d*) through what agency, through what firm and at what cost they were purchased ;

(*e*) whether they consider the Harbour Board of Tuticorin capable of bearing the heavy charge of 57 lakhs which is at present estimated to be required for the cost of the construction of the harbour ;

(*f*) whether the engineering staff employed on work of the Tuticorin Harbour have decided to go back to their regular employment and whether new staff has to be taken ;

(*g*) whether the Public Works Department have any connexion with the Harbour Engineer and whether there is any superior agency to scrutinize the estimates of the Harbour Engineer ; and

(*h*) whether it is a fact that a committee of the European Chamber of Commerce, Tuticorin, has stated in its report on the harbour scheme submitted early this year that the handling of the work has been from the start so unsatisfactory that the commercial community has lmost entirely lost faith in the abilities of the authorities concerned to complete the harbour within the present amended estimate of cost and time and that it felt that the heavy burden of debt which the port would have to face would be a menace to its trade ?

A.—(*a*) The original estimate for the Tuticorin Harbour scheme amounted to Rs. 42·24 lakhs. The revised project estimate amounts to Rs. 57 lakhs.

(*b*) The dredger 'St. George' can dredge the rock below 24 feet, but very slowly.

(*c*) No.

(*d*) The dredger 'St. David' was purchased direct from the Admiralty at a cost of £18,300 including the spare parts. The dredger 'St. George' was purchased from Messrs. Lobnits & Co., through the agency of the Director-General, India Store Department, London, at a cost of £27,485, c.i.f. Madras or Tuticorin.

(*e*) Yes.

(*f*) No.

(*g*) The answer is in the negative.

(*h*) The Government have no information.

Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar :—"With reference to (*a*) may I know whether the scheme recommended has not been estimated by that committee of experts at Rs. 160 lakhs ?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell :—"No definite recommendation in favour of any scheme has been made by the committee."

Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar :—"If the scheme suggested in place of the original one is going to cost 160 lakhs, will the Government still persist in saying that the trade of the port should bear this expenditure ?"

The hon Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell :—"The question has to be considered. It has not been recommended yet by the committee."

Mr. Daniel Thomas :—"May I know when the final report of the Harbour Committee is expected ?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell :—"I hope in about a month, Sir."

21st October 1927]

Mr. K. R. Karant :—" May I ask whether before the larger scheme of Rs. 160 lakhs or the smaller scheme is taken up finally, the Government would consult the House on the matter ? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell :—" It is a matter primarily for consideration by the Port Trust and the Government. I cannot give an undertaking that it will be placed before the House."

Mr. C. Gopala Menon :—" With reference to (*h*), will the Government be pleased to call for the information as to the opinion expressed by the committee of the European Chamber of Commerce ? "

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. Campbell :—" The authority concerned in the matter is the Port Trust Board ; the European Chamber of Commerce may, if it wishes, make proposals to the Board. I do not think it necessary to call for the opinion of a committee of the Chamber."

The hon. the President :—" Seventy-five questions and answers have been printed for to-morrow. Yet there are 127 questions for which answers have been received in my office. I wish to know the wishes of the House whether all these questions are to be placed before the House to-morrow or whether they could be held over till the 31st."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti :—" I think they may be held over to the 31st."

[*Note.*—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II

AMENDMENTS TO STANDING ORDERS—ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING THE NAMES OF MEMBERS ELECTED TO THE SELECT COMMITTEE.

The hon. the President :—" Regarding the Select Committee to be appointed to consider the amendments to the Standing Orders of the Council moved by Messrs. T. R. Venkatarama Sastriyar and D. Narayana Raju, I have to inform the House that the following six gentlemen were nominated for election :—

Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi,

Mr. P. C. Venkatapati Raju,

Abdul Hamid Khan Sahib Bahadur,

Mr. D. Narayana Raju,

Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur and

Mr. S. N. Dorai Raja.

" As the number of candidates nominated is equal to the number of vacancies to be filled, namely, six, I hereby declare the abovementioned gentlemen to be duly elected under Regulation II (4) of the Regulations for the holding of elections by means of the single transferable vote. As already announced, Rao Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu, one of the Chairmen of the Council, has been nominated by me to serve on the committee under Standing Order 76, in addition to the Deputy President and the Advocate-General who will be on the committee *ex officio*.

" I think it will be convenient for the committee to meet on the 3rd November."

TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS